

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
8

9  
10 TAEK YOON,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 LEE, ET AL.,

14 Defendants.  
15

Case No. CV 11-6792-VAP (KK)

FINAL REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED  
STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16  
17 This Final Report and Recommendation is submitted to the Honorable  
18 Virginia A. Phillips, Chief United States District Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636  
19 and General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District  
20 of California.

21 I.

22 **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

23 On August 7, 2018, defendants Pinedo and Durant specially appeared and filed  
24 a Motion to Dismiss for insufficient service of process pursuant to Federal Rule of  
25 Civil Procedure 12(b)(5) (“Motion to Dismiss”). ECF Docket No. (“Dkt.”) 126. For  
26 the reasons set forth below, the Court recommends GRANTING the Motion to  
27 Dismiss and dismissing the claims against Pinedo and Durant without prejudice for  
28 failure to serve and failure to prosecute.

1 II.

2 **PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

3 On March 17, 2013, Plaintiff constructively filed<sup>1</sup> a Second Amended  
4 Complaint (“SAC”) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1983, which includes a claim for  
5 deliberate indifference to safety against defendants Pinedo, Saavedra, Gray, and  
6 Durant in their individual capacity. Dkt. 33. On May 20, 2013, the assigned  
7 Magistrate Judge<sup>2</sup> issued a Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of  
8 various claims, but finding Plaintiff sufficiently alleged a claim against Defendants  
9 Pinedo, Durant, Gray, and Saavedra for failure to protect Plaintiff’s safety. Dkt. 38 at  
10 7-9.

11 On March 28, 2014, Plaintiff filed a Third Amended Complaint (“TAC”)  
12 alleging a single claim for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff’s serious dental needs in  
13 violation of the Eighth Amendment against Defendant Raju. Dkt. 56. On October  
14 26, 2016, the Court granted Defendant Raju’s Motion for Summary Judgment and  
15 entered Judgment dismissing the action with prejudice. Dkts. 107, 108.

16 On November 28, 2016, Plaintiff appealed the Judgment to the Ninth Circuit.  
17 Dkt. 109.

18 On December 21, 2017, the Ninth Circuit found the District Court had failed  
19 to address the deliberate indifference to safety claim in the SAC, vacated the  
20 Judgment, and remanded for further proceedings as to the deliberate indifference to  
21 safety claim only. Dkt. 112.

---

22  
23  
24  
25 <sup>1</sup> Under the “mailbox rule,” when a pro se inmate gives prison authorities a pleading  
26 to mail to court, the court deems the pleading constructively “filed” on the date it is  
27 signed. Roberts v. Marshall, 627 F.3d 768, 770 n.1 (9th Cir. 2010); Douglas v. Noelle,  
567 F.3d 1103, 1107 (9th Cir. 2009) (stating the “mailbox rule applies to § 1983 suits  
filed by pro se prisoners”).

28 <sup>2</sup> On July 7, 2014, the action was transferred to United States Magistrate Judge Kenly  
Kiya Kato. Dkts. 61, 62.

1 On March 29, 2018, the Court issued Orders directing service of process by the  
2 United States Marshal Service (“USMS”) of the SAC on defendants Pinedo, Saaveda,  
3 Gray, and Durant. Dkts. 118, 119.

4 On April 23, 2018, Plaintiff submitted four completed USM-285 forms  
5 providing information to assist the USMS in serving defendants Pinedo, Saaveda,  
6 Gray, and Durant. Dkt. 121. For defendant Pinedo, Plaintiff stated, “On 2006, M.  
7 Pinedo was a correctional officer [c/o] of California Rehabilitation Center [CRC]  
8 Fac.3 dorm 305, morning through afternoon. Now I am unable to know whether  
9 Pinedo is until in CRC or move to other prison as a c/o. If Pinedo is not in CRC, I  
10 have no idea whether this paper need to be served to warden of CRC.” Dkt. 122.  
11 For defendant Durant, Plaintiff stated: “Sgt. Durant was work as a supervisor in Fac.3  
12 program office in CRC on 2006-2007 with other defendants on morning to  
13 afternoon.” Dkt. 125.

14 On July 30, 2018, the Court received Process Receipt and Return Forms for  
15 defendants Pinedo and Durant from the USMS certifying that service was executed by  
16 personal service on July 17, 2018. Dkts. 122, 125.

17 On August 7, 2018, defendants Pinedo and Durant, specially appearing, filed  
18 the instant Motion to Dismiss Case pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
19 12(b)(5) for insufficient service of process. Dkt. 126. Defendants filed a declaration  
20 from Kevin Anthony, the Litigation Coordinator at the California Department of  
21 Corrections and Rehabilitation, California Rehabilitation Center in Norco, California  
22 (“CRC”) stating that defendant Pinedo “did not work at and had not worked at CRC  
23 since 2010” and defendant Durant “did not work at and had not worked at CRC since  
24 2009.” Dkt. 126 at 4, Declaration of Kevin Anthony, ¶¶ 1-2.

25 On September 5, 2018, Plaintiff filed an opposition that substantively  
26 addressed the Motion to Dismiss filed by defendants Saavedra and Gray, but did not  
27 substantively address the Motion to Dismiss filed by defendants Pinedo and Durant  
28 alleging insufficient service. Dkt. 128.

1 On September 18, 2018, the Court issued an Order granting Plaintiff leave to  
2 conduct limited discovery to effectuate service and an extension of time to submit  
3 completed USM-285 forms with sufficient information for the USMS to locate and  
4 serve defendants Pinedo and Durant. Dkt. 131. Plaintiff was expressly cautioned that  
5 “failure to provide sufficient information to allow the USMS to locate and serve  
6 defendants Pinedo and Durant may result in dismissal of Plaintiff’s claims against  
7 defendants Pinedo and Durant without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil  
8 Procedure 4(m) and/or 41(b).” Id. at 3.

9 On October 16, 2018, Plaintiff filed a “Motion for Issuance of Subpoenas”,  
10 which appears to be Plaintiff’s response to the Court’s September 18, 2018 Order.  
11 Dkt. 134. Plaintiff declines to serve discovery because he does not believe “any of the  
12 defendants can provide[] the information about Pinedo and Durant” and requests the  
13 Court “reserve the USM-285 FORMS which [are] attached at this motion, to the CRC  
14 Warden who can pass the 2 forms to the defendant Pineda and Durant, even [though]  
15 Pineda and Duran[t] are in other place[s] or other Prison(s) as a c/o.” Id. at 2. The  
16 USM-285 forms that were submitted by Plaintiff were rejected by the Court because  
17 the forms are incomplete, in that the service address is missing and Plaintiff instead  
18 requested they be served on the CRC Warden “who can find” defendants Durant and  
19 Pinedo. Dkt. 135.

20 On November 7, 2018, the Court issued a Report and Recommendation that  
21 the Motion to Dismiss should be granted and the claims against Pinedo and Durant  
22 should be dismissed without prejudice for failure to serve and failure to prosecute.  
23 Dkt. 137.

24 On December 19, 2018, Plaintiff filed Objections, Dkt. 145. In the Objections,  
25 Plaintiff argues he that he filed an Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss on  
26 September 5, 2018. Dkt. 145. The Court issues the instant Final Report and  
27 Recommendation addressing Plaintiff’s Objection in Section III.A. below.

28 The matter thus stands submitted.

1 III.

2 **DISCUSSION**

3 **A. PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS AGAINST DEFENDANTS PINEDO AND**  
4 **DURANT ARE SUBJECT TO DISMISSAL FOR FAILURE TO**  
5 **SERVE**

6 In cases involving a plaintiff proceeding in forma pauperis, the USMS, upon  
7 order of the Court, shall serve the summons and the complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P.  
8 4(c)(2). However, where a pro se plaintiff fails to provide the USMS with accurate  
9 and sufficient information to effect service of the summons and complaint, the  
10 Court's sua sponte dismissal of the unserved defendants is appropriate. Walker v.  
11 Sumner, 14 F.3d 1415, 1421-22 (9th Cir. 1994); Agnes v. Joseph, No. 1:10-CV-00807-  
12 LJO, 2012 WL 5424875, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2012), report and recommendation  
13 adopted, No. 1:10-CV-00807-LJO, 2012 WL 6095042 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2012)  
14 (dismissing unserved defendants after plaintiff failed to take advantage of opportunity  
15 to engage in discovery from served defendant to learn forwarding information for  
16 unserved defendants).

17 Here, according to the declaration of Kevin Anthony, the CRC Litigation  
18 Coordinator, defendants Pinedo and Durant have not been served. Moreover, despite  
19 being given an opportunity to conduct discovery and an extension of time to locate  
20 and properly serve defendants Pinedo and Durant, Plaintiff has refused to do so.  
21 Therefore, the USMS does not have sufficient information to serve defendants  
22 Pinedo and Durant. In addition, Plaintiff's "Motion for Issuance of Subpoenas" must  
23 be denied because it fails to seek issuance of subpoenas, but rather seeks service of  
24 the complaint based on incomplete USM-285 forms. Finally, Plaintiff's failure to  
25 substantively oppose the Motion to Dismiss is construed as consent to granting the  
26 Motion to Dismiss. Gerard v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., No. CV-14-03935-MMM-  
27 SHx, 2015 WL 12780486, at \*10 (C.D. Cal. May 19, 2015) (finding failure to  
28

1 substantively address claims in opposition to motion to dismiss is properly construed  
2 as consent to granting the motion).

3 Hence, the Motion to Dismiss the claims against defendants Pinedo and  
4 Durant should be granted.

5 **B. PLAINTIFF’S CLAIMS AGAINST DEFENDANTS PINEDO AND**  
6 **DURANT ARE SUBJECT TO DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE**  
7 **FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND COMPLY WITH COURT**  
8 **ORDERS**

9 In addition, it is well established that district courts have sua sponte authority  
10 to dismiss actions for failure to prosecute or to comply with court orders. See Fed. R.  
11 Civ. P. 41(b); Omstead v. Dell, Inc., 594 F.3d 1081, 1084 (9th Cir. 2010) (standard  
12 applied in dismissal for failure to prosecute); Hells Canyon Preservation Council v.  
13 U.S. Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005) (stating courts may dismiss an  
14 action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) sua sponte for a plaintiff’s  
15 failure to prosecute or comply with the rules of civil procedure or the court’s orders);  
16 Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to  
17 comply with any court order).

18 In deciding whether to dismiss for failure to prosecute or to comply with court  
19 orders, a district court must consider five factors: “(1) the public’s interest in  
20 expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court’s need to manage its docket; (3) the  
21 risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases  
22 on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions.” Omstead, 594 F.3d  
23 at 1084 (quoting Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986)); see also  
24 In re Eisen, 31 F.3d 1447, 1451 (9th Cir. 1994) (failure to prosecute); Ferdik, 963 F.2d  
25 at 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (failure to comply with court orders).

26 In the instant action, the first two factors – public interest in expeditious  
27 resolution of litigation and the court’s need to manage its docket – weigh in favor of  
28 dismissal. Despite being given an opportunity to conduct discovery, Plaintiff has

1 expressly refused to provide information necessary for the USMS to serve defendants  
2 Pinedo and Durant. This failure to prosecute hinders the Court's ability to move this  
3 case toward disposition, and suggests Plaintiff does not intend to litigate this action  
4 diligently.

5 The third factor – prejudice to defendants – also weighs in favor of dismissal.  
6 A rebuttable presumption of prejudice to a defendant arises when a plaintiff  
7 unreasonably delays prosecution of an action. See Eisen, 31 F.3d at 1452-53.  
8 Nothing suggests such a presumption is unwarranted in this case.

9 The fourth factor – public policy in favor of deciding cases on the merits –  
10 ordinarily weighs against dismissal. However, it is a plaintiff's responsibility to move  
11 towards disposition at a reasonable pace, and avoid dilatory and evasive tactics. See  
12 Morris v. Morgan Stanley, 942 F.2d 648, 652 (9th Cir. 1991). Plaintiff has not  
13 discharged this responsibility despite having been (1) instructed on his responsibilities,  
14 (2) granted sufficient time in which to discharge them, and (3) warned of the  
15 consequences of failure to do so. Under these circumstances, the policy favoring  
16 resolution of disputes on the merits does not outweigh Plaintiff's failure to obey court  
17 orders or to file responsive documents within the time granted.

18 The fifth factor – availability of less drastic sanctions – also weighs in favor of  
19 dismissal. The Court cannot move the case toward disposition without Plaintiff's  
20 compliance with court orders or participation in this litigation. Plaintiff has shown he  
21 is either unwilling or unable to comply with court orders, rules of civil procedure, and  
22 local rules by filing responsive documents or otherwise cooperating in prosecuting  
23 this action.

24 Finally, while dismissal should not be entered unless a plaintiff has been  
25 notified that dismissal is imminent, see West Coast Theater Corp. v. City of Portland,  
26 897 F.2d 1519, 1523 (9th Cir. 1990), Plaintiff was warned his "failure to provide  
27 sufficient information to allow the USMS to locate and serve defendants Pinedo and  
28

1 Durant may result in dismissal of Plaintiff's claims against defendants Pinedo and  
2 Durant without prejudice." See Dkt. 131.

3 Hence, the Court recommends dismissing the action against defendants Pinedo  
4 and Durant without prejudice for failure to prosecute and comply with court orders.

5 **IV.**

6 **RECOMMENDATION**

7 IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED that the Court issue an Order: (1)  
8 accepting this Final Report and Recommendation; (2) GRANTING the Motion to  
9 Dismiss; (3) dismissing the claims in the SAC against defendants Pinedo and Durant  
10 without prejudice; and (4) DENYING Plaintiff's Motion for Issuance of Subpoenas.

11

12 Dated: January 8, 2019



13 HONORABLE KENLY KIYA KATO  
14 United States Magistrate Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28